REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. New claims 14 and 15 have been added.

Specification

Minor changes have been made to the specification to place it in better form for U.S.

practice.

Substitute Specification

The above-noted specification changes are set forth in the attached Substitute

Specification. The Substitute Specification does not contain new matter.

A Comparison Specification showing the matter being added to and deleted from the

original specification is also submitted herewith.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to approve the Substitute Specification.

Claim Objections

Claims 4-6 and 11 have been objected to as being in improper form.

Claim 4 has been amended to overcome this objection.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this objection.

Further, claims 4-6 and 11, variously dependent on claim1, are allowable at least for their

dependency on claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because of

some informalities.

The rejected claims have been amended to overcome this rejection.

Docket No.: 4881-0106P

Reply dated April 19, 2006

Reply to Office Action of January 19, 2006

Page 9 of 13

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Further, minor changes have been made to the pending claims to place them in better

form for U.S. practice.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

(a) Claims 1-3, 7, 12, and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being

anticipated by Koizumi (USP 4,923,071). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Koizumi discloses a jib crane having a boom section 12 and main girders 22 and 21

pivotally attached to one end of the boom section 12. The main girder 21 has a cylinder tube 32,

a piston rod 31 that freely slides inside the cylinder tube 32, and a girder tube 6 that receives the

cylinder tube 32. The cylinder tube 32 has a guide member 34 that engages guide grooves

formed in the guide tube 6 (see Fig. 7), such that the cylinder tube 32 rotates with respect to the

guide tube 6 as it moves inside the guide tube 6.

Neither the piston rod 31 and the cylinder tube 32 (which corresponds to the

"mechanically adjustable telescoping means" of the present invention) nor the guide tube 6 and

the cylinder tube 32 (which arguably corresponds to the "mechanically adjustable telescoping

means") is "adapted to limit a length thereof to an adjusted length when the pressure load is

being applied between the folding pinnacle and the boom and to allow the length thereof to

extend freely when no pressure load is being applied." Accordingly, Koizumi fails to disclose or

suggest the "mechanically adjustable telescoping means" as recited in claim 1.

Claims 2-3, 7, 12, and 13, variously dependent on claim 1, are allowable at least for their

dependency on claim 1.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Reply dated April 19, 2006

Reply to Office Action of January 19, 2006

Page 10 of 13

(b) Claims 1-3, 7-10, 12, and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as

being anticipated by Payson (USP 2,147,313). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Payton discloses a stub mast 30 having a plurality of holes 30 and a gear 33 having a

plurality of pin teeth 32 that engages with the holes 30 such that the stub mast 30 can be retracted

or extended by rotation of the gear 33. The mast 30 is slidably supported by an angular guide 29.

In Payton, however, the mast 30 in combination with the gear 33 does not "limit a length

thereof to an adjusted length when the pressure load is being applied between the folding

pinnacle and the boom and to allow the length thereof to extend freely when no pressure load is

being applied." Accordingly, Payton fails to disclose or suggest the "mechanically adjustable

telescoping means" as recited in claim 1.

Claims 2-3, 7-10, 12, and 13, variously dependent on claim 1, are allowable at least for

their dependency on claim 1.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(c) Claims 1-3, 10, and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being

anticipated by Koizumi (USP 5,115,925). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Koizumi discloses a telescopic boom 1, a jib 2, and an auxiliary connector 3 fixed to a

lower surface of the beam 2a of the jib 2. The auxiliary connector 3 (corresponds to the

"mechanically adjustable telescoping means") has a cylindrical housing 32 and a connecting rod

33 axially inserted through the housing 32.

The auxiliary connector 3, however, does not "limit a length thereof to an adjusted length

when the pressure load is being applied between the folding pinnacle and the boom and to allow

the length thereof to extend freely when no pressure load is being applied." Accordingly,

Reply dated April 19, 2006

Reply to Office Action of January 19, 2006

Page 11 of 13

Koizumi fails to disclose or suggest the "mechanically adjustable telescoping means" as recited

in claim 1.

Claims 2-3, 10, and 13, variously dependent on claim 1, are allowable at least for their

dependency on claim 1.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(d) Claims 1-3, 7, and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being

anticipated by Bakhtin (SU 619588) and by Wardlaw (USP 3,899,089). This rejection is

respectfully traversed.

Bakhtin discloses a telescopic tie 1 that connects two parts 2, 3 of a boom by means of

openings 4 and a fixing pin 5.

The telescopic tie 1 in conjunction with the openings 4 and the fixing pin 5 does not

"limit a length thereof to an adjusted length when the pressure load is being applied between the

folding pinnacle and the boom and to allow the length thereof to extend freely when no pressure

load is being applied." Accordingly, Bakhtin fails to disclose or suggest the "mechanically

adjustable telescoping means" as recited in claim 1.

Wardlaw discloses a brace member 176 (corresponds to the "mechanically adjustable

telescoping means") that has a lower tubular member 182 which receives a smaller-in-diameter

upper tubular member 184 therein, the upper member 184 having a stop collar 186 thereon. The

two telescopic members 182 and 184 have alignable diametrical bores 188 therethrough, for

reception of a securing pin 190 that is utilized to fix the telescopic brace member 176 at a chosen

length.

Reply dated April 19, 2006

Reply to Office Action of January 19, 2006

Page 12 of 13

In Wardlaw, however, the two telescopic members 182 and 184 in conjunction with the

bores 188 and the pin 190 do not does not "limit a length thereof to an adjusted length when the

pressure load is being applied between the folding pinnacle and the boom and to allow the length

thereof to extend freely when no pressure load is being applied."

Further, although the stop collar 186 may prevent the member 184 from being retracted

inside the member 182 beyond a predetermined shortest length, the stop collar 186 alone cannot

adjust the length of the brace member 176 unless the pin 190 is inserted in one of the bores 188.

Once the pin 190 is inserted in one of the bores, the member 184 is locked and cannot be

extended freely with respect to the member 182. Accordingly, Wardlaw fails to disclose or

suggest the "mechanically adjustable telescoping means" as recited in claim 1.

Claims 2-3, 7, and 10, variously dependent on claim 1, are allowable at least for their

dependency on claim 1.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

New Claims

New claims 14 and 15, variously dependent on claim 1, are allowable at least for their

dependency on claim 1.

A favorable determination by the Examiner and allowance of these claims is earnestly

solicited.

Conclusion

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the

rejections and objections, and allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP CG/MH/pjh

Reply dated April 19, 2006

Reply to Office Action of January 19, 2006

Page 13 of 13

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present

application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Maki Hatsumi (#40,417) at the

telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite

prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future

replies, to charge payment or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any

additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension

of time fees.

Dated: April 19, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Charles Gorenstein

Registration No.: 29,271

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

Attachments: Substitute Specification - 7 pages

Comparison Specification - 7 pages